



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III. — *Dissimilative Writings for ii and iii in Latin*

BY PROFESSOR ROLAND G. KENT

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

1. INTERVOCALIC *j*¹ in Latin, as is well known, makes the preceding syllable long, in that it represents two sounds — an *i*² forming a diphthong with the preceding vowel, and a *j* beginning the next syllable.³ Phonetic spellings are seen in the inscriptional EIIVS EIIVS EIIVS,⁴ manuscript *aiiunt eiius*,⁵ and Cicero's *aiio Maiia*.⁶ Therefore *major pejor Troja hujus Pompejus* are pronounced *mai-jor pei-jor Troi-ja hui-jus Pompei-jus*.

It is likewise well known that when in inflection or in word-formation an *ī* comes to stand immediately after *j*, the *j* disappears;⁷ thus *Pompejus*, gen. sing. and nom. pl. *Pompei*, dat.-abl. pl. *Pompeis*; *ajo ais ait*; *jacio abicio reicio*.⁸

2. This paper proposes to deal with the following series of problems: If *j* is lost before *ī*, why is the penult of *Pompei* and similar words long? Why is the initial syllable of *abicio* and the like ordinarily long, though sometimes short? Why is *rei-* in *reicio* ordinarily trochaic in value, though sometimes a single long syllable? In these words and forms what is the relation between the graphic representations and the spoken words? What is the logic of the graphic representation, in inscriptions especially, of words which in normal Latin contain dissyllabic *īj* in hiatus?

3. For clearness' sake it is necessary here to present in

¹ I use *j* and *v* for consonant *i* and *u*, for purposes of clearness.

² Strictly *i*; but as diphthongs are commonly written *ai ei* etc., not *aī eī* etc., I shall use the pure vowel sign to indicate the second element of the diphthong.

³ Sommer, *Hdb. d. lat. Laut.- u. Formenlehre*, p. 171.

⁴ Respectively, *CIL*. II, 1065, 1953, 4157.

⁵ Plautus, *Merc.* 469, *Most.* 981, Ambr. pal.; cf. Prisc. II, 303 K.

⁶ Quint. I, 4, 11; Vel. Long. VII, 54 f. K.

⁷ Sommer, *op. cit.*, pp. 171 f.

⁸ The quantities of vowels are not marked in this paper, except where for special reasons it becomes desirable.

brief the results of the investigation: intervocalic *ij* as in *ajo*, postvocalic *iji* as in *Pompei*, postconsonantal *ji* as in *abicio*,¹ postvocalic *iji* as in *reicio*, are all normally represented by a single *l* in writing; and, conversely, the writing *ll* or *lll* is avoided in older inscriptions, except in those where *ll* is a form taken by the letter *e*.

4. The rules of §1 work with perfect regularity in the forms of the verb *ajo*:² *ajo*, *ajunt*, *ajebam* etc., *ajas* show a long initial syllable; *ais ait* have lost the intervocalic *j* and are dissyllables with the first syllable short;³ *aibam* etc. have the diphthong;⁴ *ain* has the regular loss of the *j*, but is peculiar. *Ain* is for *ais-ne*, and the *ai-* may in all instances in Plautus and Terence have been contracted to a diphthong,⁵ though pyrrhic value cannot be disproved; where *ain* is dissyllabic, it may always be a trochee, and is always followed by a consonant; we may therefore read *aine*.⁶

Here, except for the sporadic attempts listed in §1, we have the writing *l* for intervocalic *-ij-*, with entire regularity, and with equal regularity the loss of the *-ij-* before *ĭ*.

5. Words of the type *Pompei*, gen. sing. and nom. pl., and

¹ For words of this type this explanation is given by Quint. I, 4, 11, and by Gell. IV, 17; the latter remarks that such words are often erroneously read with length of the vowel of the initial syllable, but that the length is really that of the syllable, by position. The principle is however of much wider application.

² Citations are hardly necessary to prove these statements.

³ A similar combination of sounds is found in *meite*, Pers. I, 114 = *mei-jite*. *meite* is the reading of Santi Consoli in his critical edition (1904), and he notes no Ms. variants. The intervocalic *j* has here been restored, as in *Pompei*, §5.

It is rather hard to say why *ais ait* neither restored the *j* nor contracted the two vowels; possibly their colloquial use prevented the restoration, and the analogy of dissyllabic *ajo ajunt* prevented contraction.

⁴ *aibam* never was *a-ibam* any more than voc. *Pompei* (§5, footnote) was trissyllabic; *ai-jo*: *ai-bam* = *servi-(i)o*: *servi-bam*. Failure to change the *ai-* to *ae-* was due to the influence of the *aj-* of other forms and of the *-i-* before the *-bam* in *servi-bam*, etc.

⁵ Contraction in *ain* seems to occur because it stands outside the regular paradigmatic scheme, and hence was not so subject to the influence of analogy as were *ais* and *ait*.

⁶ So Plaut. *Am.* 284, 344, *As.* 901, *Curc.* 323, *Most.* 383. That *ain* unchanged should be dissyllabic with a long initial syllable is impossible, since we never find **ajis*, from which might come **ajisne*, whence spondaic **ajin*.

Pompeis, dat.-abl. pl., have a spondaic ending, as is shown by numerous passages in the poets;¹ and the orthography is assured by occurrences in inscriptions of republican times: COCCEI POMPEI LAVINEI NASVLEI MAI(s),² as well as upon those of later date.³ According to the rule, intervocalic *j* should be lost in these forms; but evidently, as *Pompejus* is sounded *Pompei-jus*, metrically — ∪, and *Pompei Pompeis* are metrically — —, the latter forms must be graphic for *Pompei-jī Pompei-jīs*,⁴ with restoration of the intervocalic *j* by analogy of other forms of the paradigm, where *j* stood

¹ *Pompei*, gen. sing., Lucan II, 280, 283, v, 205, VI, 245, 589, VII, 112, 196, 492, 694, 708, VIII, 69, 161, 532, 677, 751, 794, 820, 836, IX, 227, 600, 1050, X, 1, 381, 388. *Grai*, nom. pl., Lucr. I, 831, II, 629, III, 100, VI, 908; Catull. 68, 109; Prop. II, 34 (III, 32), 65; Verg. *Aen.* I, 467, 530, II, 727, III, 163, VI, 242, VIII, 135. *plebei*, nom. pl., Plaut. *Poen.* 515. *Grais*, Prop. III (IV), 22, 37; Verg. *Georg.* II, 16, *Aen.* II, 786, III, 398, 499, VI, 529, X, 430. *Bais*, Prop. I, II, 1; Hor. *Carm.* II, 18, 20, *Epist.* I, I, 83. *Circeis*, Hor. *Sat.* II, 4, 33.

² Respectively, *CIL.* I, 1044, 1079, 1229, 1426, 838.

³ So POMPEI, *Mon. Anc.* VI, 37-38, *Fasti Cons. Cap.* anno 758; GAI, *CIL.* v, 5050; GAI, *CIL.* XI, 1421; PACTVMEI, *CIL.* v, 1326; SEI, *CIL.* v, 1369; ATTEI, *CIL.* v, 4091; VEI, *CIL.* x, 901; POMPVCLEI, *CIL.* IX, 3943; MAIS *bis*, *Fasti Venus.* in *CIL.* I, 1², p. 66.

Words of more than two syllables in *-ajus* should by the rules of vowel weakening have *-ejus* (Sommer, p. 116); cf. Lat. *Pompejanus* and Osc. *Púmpaiians*. *-ajus* is therefore evidence of dialectal origin; for this, however, *-aeus* often appears, by the influence of the usual change of AI to AE; and at times E appears as a late writing for this AE. Thus we find *Annajus Annejus Annaeus Anneus*. The gen. sing. and nom. pl. should be ANNAI ANNEI ANNAEI ANNEI respectively, of which ANNAEI is merely after the analogy of the spelling of the other cases. There are the following forms:

GEN. SING.

ANNAI, *CIL.* VI, 11670, IX, 4558.

MELISSAI, *CIL.* x, 893.

PEDVCAI *bis*, *CIL.* IX, 4582.

ANNEI, *CIL.* II, 4970⁷⁰, III, 1629⁸, 3852 *bis*, v, 8114⁴, 8115⁸.

ANNAEI, *CIL.* III, 6374.

MELISSAEI, *CIL.* x, 824, 895, (MELISSAEI) 899.

POPPAEI, *CIL.* x, 827, 1906, XIV, 4091⁸⁷.

NOM. PL.

POPPAEI, *CIL.* IV, 357; POPPAEEI (—EI = ē), IX, 5074.

⁴ The only exceptions of which I am aware are *Grāi*, Terent. Maur. VI, 339, 344 K., *Grāis*, *ib.* 339 K. (verses 453, 656, 467).

before some other vowel than *ĩ*.¹ In confirmation of this is the statement that Caesar wrote *Pompeiii*,² a true representation of the sounds. The restored *j* appears graphically also in *CIL*. I, 1175, *VERTVLEIEIS*, a nom. pl. with added *s*,³ where the second *EI* is for *ĩ*; the value of the form is, therefore, phonetically *Vertulei-ĩs*, or, in normalized orthography, *Vertulejĩs*. But the usual spelling of these forms is with a single *l* for the threefold sound.⁵

6. Compounds of *jacio*⁶ in which the prefix ends in a consonant are *abicio*, *adicio*, *conicio*,⁷ *disicio*, *inicio* (and *superinicio*), *obicio*, *subicio*.⁸ The initial syllable is either long or (less often) short.⁹ The history of these forms seems to be, if we take *adicio* as the type of the class: **ad-jacio* became by regular weakening **ad-jecio*.¹⁰ Inasmuch as *e* did not weaken to *i* after vowel *i*,¹¹ it is likely that it did not do so after consonantal *i*; hence **ad-jecio* changed to *ad-jicio* by analogy to *facio afficio*. In *ad-jicio* the *j* was lost before the *i*, giving

¹ Voc. *Pompei*, Hor. *Carm.* II, 7, 5, *Voltei*, Hor. *Epist.* I, 7, 91, cannot take a restored *j*, since a vocative **Pompejĩ* is out of the question; with voc. *-ei* to nom. *-ejus*, cf. voc. *fili* to nom. *filius*. Cf. Prisc. II, 303 K.

² Prisc. II, 14 K.

³ Cf. Sommer, p. 378.

⁴ Cf. §12. This inscription must be placed after 150 B.C., since it contains *AFLEICTA* for *afflicta*, which has original *ĩ*.

⁵ The dat. sing. *ei* is considered in §19.

⁶ This subject is treated in detail by M. W. Mather, "Quo modo iaciendi verbi composita in praesentibus temporibus enuntiaverint antiqui et scripserint," in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, VI (1895), 83-151, with a summary of previous modern studies, pp. 83-87.

⁷ On *conicio* and *coicio*, v. Mather, 121-123; Neue-Wagener, *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, II³, 864 f.; *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, s.v. *conicio*.

⁸ *Superjacio* appears only in the recomposed form; *amicio* never has length of the initial syllable, and therefore does not fall within the province of the present inquiry.

⁹ For citations, v. Mather, 130-151; for discussion, v. 87-104. To his lists should be added *cōnicit*, Ter. *HT.* 277; *ādicit*, Ovid *Met.* XIV, 276; *ādice*, Manil. I, 666; *ādicit*, Sil. Ital. XVII, 528; and the similar word **objex* should be included: *ōbicem*, Plaut. *Persa* 203; *ōbice*, Verg. *Georg.* IV, 422, *Aen.* VIII, 227, X, 377, XI, 890, Ovid *Met.* III, 571, XI, 780, *F.* I, 563; *obicius*, Verg. *Georg.* II, 480. Cf. also *Thes. L. L.*, with some bibliography.

¹⁰ That **ad-jacio* became *adicio* by syncope and samprasāraṇa (Sommer, p. 148) seems to me less probable than the explanation given above, despite *quatio concutio*.

¹¹ Sommer, p. III.

adicio, with short initial syllable. The analogy of *jacio jeci jactus* and *adjeci adjectus* restored *j* in the present system, giving *adicio*, with initial syllable long by position.

Inscriptional writings¹ and most forms in Mss. agree on *-icio*, and show that this was the normal orthography, whether the pronunciation was *ad-icio* or *ad-jicio*. But we find also CONIECIANT,² *CIL.* I, 198, dated 123/2 B.C., and PROIECI-TAD,³ *CIL.* IX, 782, of an earlier date not determinable; the same writing *-ie-* is seen also in numerous readings of rather old Mss.⁴ Such IE is graphic for II = *-ji-*,⁵ a dissimilative change precisely parallel to the use of VO for *-vu-*.⁶ Writings with *-ii-* are found not at all in inscriptions,⁷ and only in late Mss.⁸

Thus, when the initial syllable is long, the usual representation -ICIO has the I = *-ji-*, an instance of dissimilative loss in writing; that with -IECIO shows a dissimilative change in the writing.

7. Compounds of *jacio* in which the prefixed element ends in a vowel are: *coicio*, *deicio*, *ecio*, *proicio*, *reicio*, *traicio*.⁹ Here the portion before the *-cio* is ordinarily trochaic, but sometimes contracted to a single syllable.¹⁰ The history is

¹ Mather, 127-129, cites 11 examples, to which should be added ADICERE(*m*), *CIL.* III, 14206²¹; ADICIATVR, *CIL.* VIII, 18042.

² The same inscription shows E for *ī* in OPPEDEIS, though the weakening to *ī* was complete by that time; cf. EXIGATVR TRANSDITO EDITO EDIDERIT, on the same stone.

³ Though properly belonging in §7, this form is listed here on account of the use of IE; its interpretation is complicated by the difference of present formation and by the dialectal character of the form.

⁴ Mather, 111-113.

⁵ That it represents *-je-* (cf. Sommer, p. 522), seems to me a needless assumption of a third form for these words, in addition to those with *-i-* and *-ji-*.

⁶ Anderson, *TAPA.* XL, 99-105.

⁷ Except on one spurious inscription, *CIL.* X, 1, 204*; cf. Mather, 89, 129.

⁸ Mather, 89-92. *Dissicio* for *disicio* is an attempt to show the length of the initial syllable by doubling the *s* in imitation of the *ss* of *dis-secare*, a word of similar meaning; cf. Mather, 123-126.

⁹ *Pracicio* does not occur in the poets.

¹⁰ A pyrrhic value is unlikely; cf. Mather, 113. For citations, v. Mather, 130-151; for his discussion, 104-120. To his lists should be added *trā-icit*, Prop. I, 19, 12; *trā-ice*, Prop. II, 12 (III, 3), 18; *trā-icit*, Prop. IV (v), 2, 36; *prō-iciam*, Verg. *Aen.* v, 238.

the same as in *abicio* etc.; when the stage *-icio* is reached, the *-i-* contracts with the preceding vowel to form a diphthong, or the *-j-* is restored. The pronunciation was *coi-jicio*, *dei-jicio*, etc.¹ The normal spelling of Mss. and inscriptions² is with *-ICIO*; but the same variation with *-IE-* occurs.³ *-ii-* occurs only in late Mss.;⁴ very rarely, Ms. writings are found with an inserted *-h-* to mark the hiatus.⁵

Herein, when there is no contraction to a diphthong, I represents *-i-j-*, of which the first element forms a diphthong with the preceding vowel—a dissimilative loss of two of the three *i*'s; and the less usual IE represents likewise *-i-j-*, with dissimilative loss of one *i* and dissimilative change of the last one to E.

8. Thus the character I, in addition to its usual values of *ī ī j*, may have the value *jř* after consonants and the values

¹ Unless the influence of *dē, ē, prō, trā-* (*-veho*, etc.) produces *dē-jicio* etc. For *coi-jicio*, v. Vel. Long. vii, 54 K. For the doubling of the *j*, so as to form a diphthong with the preceding vowel, as well as the initial sound of the second syllable, the fact that *ex, prod-, red-* (Walde, *Lat. etym. Wb.*² s.v. *re-red-*), *trans* end in consonants, offers some phonetic warrant; in *deicio*, however, an analogy must have operated.

Initial *j* in the second element of a compound, when the first element ends in a vowel, does not automatically geminate so as to produce a diphthong with the preceding vowel, or *ī* with a preceding *ī*: witness *bijugis*, Verg. *Georg.* iii, 91, *Aen.* xii, 355, *Cu.* 202, 283, Ovid *Met.* iv, 24, Sen. *Phaed.* 1101, Val. Fl. ii, 566, vi, 413; *bijugus*, Lucr. ii, 601, v, 1299, 1300, Verg. *Aen.* v, 144, x, 253, 399, 453, 575, 587, 595, Val. Fl. vii, 218, Stat. *Theb.* ii, 723, *Ach.* i, 222, Mart. i, 12, 8, Sil. Ital. ii, 82, *CIL.* ii, 4314; *quadrījugis*, Verg. *Aen.* x, 571; *quadrījugus*, Enn. Sc. 101 Vahlen², Verg. *Georg.* iii, 18, *Aen.* xii, 162, Ovid *Am.* iii, 2, 66, *Met.* ii, 168, ix, 272, *Tr.* iv, 2, 54, Drusi *Epiced.* 332, Stat. *Theb.* vi, 370, xii, 533, Sil. Ital. iv, 439, *CIL.* ii, 4314. The inscriptional forms alluded to are BIVGIS and QVADRIIVGOS.

In *dijudico* and *dijungo* (oftener *disjungo*) we have *dī-* for *dis-* before *j*, either phonetically or by analogy (Sommer, p. 225; cf. Brugmann, *Gdr.*² i, 763 f.); cf. *dijudicare*, Ter. *HT.* 237, *dijudicent*, *ib.* 504, *dijudica*, *ib.* 986, *dijunxit*, Ter. *Hec.* 161, *dijungimur*, Plaut. *Mil.* 1328 for *digungitur* of the codd. Pal., *dijunge*, Plaut. *Poen.* 1406, and the noteworthy DIVNXISSET avoiding II, Marini, *Acta Frat. Arv.*, p. 712 (not accessible to me, but cited by Forcellini s.v. *disjungo*).

² Mather, 127–129, cites 12 examples from inscriptions, all with *-IC-*, besides PROIECITAD, already noticed. To his list may be added COICIANTVR, *CIL.* vi, 36467.

³ Mather, 110–113.

⁴ *Ibid.* 116–119.

⁵ *Ibid.* 120.

*ij ij̃ ij̃*¹ after vowels. This accords perfectly with the comments of Gell. iv, 17² and of Donat. ad Ter. *And.* 173, *nulla littera vocalis geminata unam syllabam facit*.³

9. If now the doubling of l was avoided in the normal orthography of Latin, except when ll represented the vowels of two syllables,⁴ how did this dislike display itself in the republican inscriptions?

10. We may recall that VO was written in final VOS and in similar combinations long after it had become *vu* in sound, in order to avoid the writing VV;⁵ but the retention of older VO was hardly due to any ambiguity in the sound of VV. For example, SERVVS and NOVVS can suggest no probable incorrect pronunciation, except that in *-ūs*; but the doubling of vowels to indicate length does not appear until Gracchan times, while VO as merely graphic for *vu* is established by Anderson⁶ in the plays of Plautus. The true explanation of the phenomenon must be the unconditioned reluctance to double any character in writing.

There is a dislike to use VV, not only for *vu*, but also for *uv*, whether *uv* goes back to an earlier *uv* or to an earlier *ov*. Thus, no *v* is written in *fui*⁷ *fruor pruina*. But in normal orthography, for clearness, VV for *uv* is employed initially, after initial *j*, and medially before *i* plus a vowel: so *ūva*, *ūvidus*, *juvenis*, *Pācuuius*. But even in these positions it is not always written⁸ in the older inscriptions, which often prefer older OV or the single V:⁹

¹ In these, of course, the first *i* forms a diphthong with the preceding vowel.

² V. footnote to §3.

³ The prescription by Accius of AA EE OO VV for *ā ē ō ū* (Quint. i, 7, 14; Mar. Vict. vi, 8 K.; Ter. Scaur. vii, 18 K.; Vel. Long. vii, 55 K.) is no real exception, for these writings never became the normal orthography, and never gained even fairly extended use.

⁴ And in the rare combination of postconsonantal *ij*, as in *dijudico dijungo, bijugis -us, quadrijugis -us*; cf. §7, footnote.

⁵ Anderson, *TAPA*. xi, 99-105.

⁶ *Loc. cit.*

⁷ FVVEIT, *CIL*. i, 1051, is quite exceptional, as against FUET, *CIL*. i, 32, FVIT, *CIL*. i, 30, 196, etc.

⁸ While manuscript authority cannot be relied on in such matters as these, reference may be made to Lachmann ad Lucr. v, 679, and L. Müller *De re metrica* 251 f. ed. 1, 293 f. ed. 2.

⁹ Two apparent instances of VV may be disposed of: nom. FWLI, *CIL*. i, 1406,

FLOVIOM, FLOVIVM *septies*, FLOVI nom. pl., COMFLOVONT, and FLVIO abl., COMFLVONT, *CIL.* I, 199; FLOVIO abl. *quater*, *ibid.*

SOVO abl. and SVOM, *CIL.* I, 1007.

SOVEIS dat. and SVOS nom. *ter*, SVO abl. *bis*, as well as SVEI *bis*, SVAE, SVA abl. *quater*, *CIL.* I, 198.¹

IVENTA, *CIL.* I, 1202; IVENTIA, *CIL.* I, 885, with *juv-*.

ASVIA, *CIL.* I, 1204; LIGVIVS, 1341; VESVIES, 817, all with *-uvi-*.

To these may be added V for *vu* in VIVS, *CIL.* I, 1223.

Thus the tendency not to write VV is very strong, even when ambiguity results from its avoidance.

11. A similar avoidance of II in early inscriptions may be expected. Now monosyllabic II, and III after vowels, would be looked for only in those classes of words already discussed in §§3-8, where the inscriptional examples show normally I.

Dissyllabic *ii* occurs in the following classes of words: (1) the gen. sing. of M. and N. (*i*)*io*-stems; (2) the nom. pl. of M. (*i*)*io*-stems, and the dat. sing. of *alius*; (3) the dat.-abl. pl. of M. and N. (*i*)*io*-stems, and of F. (*i*)*īā*-stems; (4) certain forms of *deus is meus*;² (5) certain perfect forms of verbs of the types *abii petii munii*. These may be taken up in turn.

12. However, for the clearer understanding of what the written words may represent, a review of the phonetic history of these forms is essential.

In the gen. sing., the *o*-stems had original *-ei*,³ which in

may be miswritten for FVLVI(*us*), rather than a representation of *Fūli(us)*, as the note in *CIL.* suggests; and COINVCI, *CIL.* I, 1242, which may be COIIVCI, according to the note in *CIL.*, is rather miswritten for CONIVCI; cf. the forms CONIVNXS, 1011, CONIVGI, 1053, COIVGI, 1064, 1413, CONIVGEM, 1479, CONIVGE, 1220.

¹ Also SVVO, *CIL.* I, 1242, SVVM, *CIL.* I, 206; but with the latter SVI *bis*, SVORM, SVEIS are found.

² Strictly, these contain *e-i*; but for convenience they are included here. Cf. Sturtevant, *Contraction in the Case Forms of the Latin io- and īā-Stems, and of deus, is, and idem*, Chicago, 1902.

³ I follow Ehrlich, *Untersuchungen über d. Natur d. griech. Betonung*, 66-76, who advances this theory and the theory that *ei* in unaccented syllables became *ī* much earlier than did original *ai oi*.

unaccented syllables became \bar{i} very early; (i) $\bar{i}o$ -stems had $-(i)\bar{i}ei$, which became $-i\bar{i}$ or $-\bar{i}\bar{i}$ and contracted to $-\bar{i}$ before any of the extant forms.

The plural forms contain other diphthongs, which became monophthongal less early. $-oi$ $-\bar{o}is$ $-\bar{a}is$ in final syllables became $-ei$ $-\bar{e}is$; not later than the middle of the third century B.C., these became close $-\bar{e}$ $-\bar{e}s$, and are sometimes written E ES, though EI EIS are more usual. About 150 B.C., these sounds became $-\bar{i}$ $-\bar{i}s$, and might be written I IS. After this date, EI and I are graphically interchangeable for \bar{i} of any origin. When the forms of io - $i\bar{a}$ -stems reached the stage $-i\bar{i}$ $-\bar{i}\bar{i}s$, about 150 B.C., contraction to $-\bar{i}$ $-\bar{i}s$ took place;¹ but analogy brought back the dissyllabic forms, and both were in use.

But Brugmann² now holds that after i , ei became \bar{e} and developed no farther; hence forms in $-i\bar{i}$ $-\bar{i}\bar{i}s$, and the contractions thereof have \bar{i} merely by analogy of the forms of pure o - \bar{a} -stems.³

The history of verb forms in $-iai$ is similar to that of the nom. pl. in $-ioi$.

As for eo -stems (is *idem deus meus*), contraction took place well before 200 B.C., at the time when eei reached the stage $e\bar{e}$;⁴ the resulting \bar{e} became \bar{i} about 150 B.C., like any other \bar{e} . The re-formations with dissyllabic ei were used even in Plautus, except those from *deus*, which cannot be proved earlier than in the poems of Catullus.⁵

E, = \bar{e} , may also at any date be rustic Latin or dialectal for an earlier ei .

Of the inscriptions in *CIL*. I, those falling before the important dividing line of 150 B.C., so far as they are cited in this paper, are as follows:

¹ The application of the law of iambic shortening removes the necessity of supposing that contraction in such forms had occurred by the time of Plautus, despite the citations of Neue-Wagener, 1³, 159 and 189 f.

² *Kurze vergl. Gram.* I, p. 255.

³ In ejo - ajo -stems, the gen. sing. should from the earliest times have EI AI, representing $-ej\bar{i}$ $-aj\bar{i}$, with restored j ; the pl. forms should show EIEI EIEIS AIEI AIEIS until 150 B.C., and thence onward EI EIS AI AIS, = $ej\bar{i}$ etc., with restored j .

⁴ Sturtevant, pp. 32-35.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 21.

CIL. I, 1-194: date, before the Hannibalic war.

195: date, 260 B.C., but restored under Claudius.

196: date, 186 B.C.

530, 531: date, 211 B.C.

13. The gen. sing. of M. and N. *io*-stems ends in *l*, or in *El* graphic for *l*, on republican inscriptions.¹ Examples from *CIL.* I are as follows:

198 CONSILI; 200 IVDICI; 204 PORTORI; 205 MVNICI-
PEI; 206 AEDIFICI *ter*, MVNICIPI *quinquies*; 571 IOVEI
(from *Jovius*), LAETORI; 577 SERAPI; 587, 589 BENEFICI;
602, 11 exx. in -l; 623 FEILI; 804 SVLPICEI; 930 PA-
PIRI; 1013, 1014 VERGILEI; 1015 VERGILI; 1042
CLODI; 1063 FVLVI, IVLI, IVLI; 1079 SALVI; 1107
ANVLARI, CONLEGI; 1108 CONLEGEI; 1213 CVL-
TRARI; 1241 OCTAVI; 1305 CORRI; 1374 AMPVDI.

STATII 757 and CAESII 758 are the only genitives in *ll*, in *CIL.* I, among the inscriptions of republican date; but they are perhaps of the year 8 A.D.² We find also OSTIEI, gen. to *ostium*, in *CIL.* I, 577, an imperial copy of an inscription of 105 B.C.; but as the same inscription exhibits the gen. SERAPI, the form OSTIEI appears to be due simply to the stone-cutter, to represent the dissyllabic pronunciation familiar to him. It is, however, noteworthy that his IEI shows a graphic dissimilation of *ll*, as it represents *l* after *l* by *El*.

14. The nom. pl. of M. (*i*)*io*-stems ended originally in *-ioi*, appearing in earliest Latin as *-iei*, whence *-iē* about 250 B.C., and *-ī* about 150, contracting to *-ī* or kept by the analogy of other cases.³ Old Latin often adds *s*, in imitation of the plurals of consonant-stems and *i*-stems.⁴ Of such forms we actually find, in *CIL.* I:

¹ The first undoubted examples of dissyllabic *-ī* occur in Catullus; cf. Neue-Wagener, ¹³, 134-154, especially 145 f. W. Merrill, *Univ. Calif. Publ. in Cl. Phil.* II, 57-79, argues for its appearance earlier, but fails to prove his point.

² Cf. a.in. ad. inscc. in *CIL.* I.

³ Cf. §12.

⁴ Cf. Sommer, p. 378.

Ending in *-iei*, with or without added *s* :

- 199 MINVCIEIS; 204 SOCIEI; 575 (*Cla*)VDIEI; 578 (*p*)IEI; 580 PIEI; 807 IVLIEI; 1024 ALFIEIS; 1091 THVRA-RIE(*i*); 1129 CISIARIEI; 1165 SALONIEI; 1210 VN-GVENTARIEI; 1275 FILIEI; 1295 (*au*)XSILIARIEI; 1424 (*Ju*)LIEI; 1481 ROSCIEIS; 1497 TOSSIEIS.

Ending in *-ie*, with added *s* :

- 42 ATILIES; 199 VITVRIES *bis*; 425 MEMIES; 817 VE-SVIES; 1289 MODIES; *CIL.* VI, 169¹ ROSARIES, VIOLARIES.

Contracted forms in *l* or *El* = *ī*, some with added *s* :²

- 199 FLOVI; 206 LIBRAREI; 579 LVCCI; 1041 SOCEI; 1092 TVRAREIS; 1131 LANI; 1272 FILEI; 1284 FEILEI; 1541 *b* FILIS.

These forms show a distinct avoidance of *ll* = *īī*, in the uncontracted forms, where *IEI* is regularly used to indicate the dissyllabic nature and to avoid the graphic doubling of *l*. While this use of *El* has of course etymological warrant,³ that does not explain the consistency of its use, for in the contracted forms *l* appears in about half of the instances, and not *El*. Further, in the very inscriptions showing nom. pl. in *IEI*, the pure *o*-stems show nom. pl. forms in *l* and *IS*, and dat.-abl. pl. forms in *IS* :⁴

CIL. I, 199 IVDICATI, DAMNATI, HISCE, FRVCTI *bis*, CETERI, (abl.) TERMINIS; 204 PROGNATI, LEIBERI; 1024 (abl.) LIBERTIS, NOSTRIS,

which shows that the use of *l* = *ī* in these plural forms was familiar to the cutters of the inscriptions. Evidently the use of *El* = *ī* depends here upon the preceding *l* : another instance of graphic dissimilation.

¹ CORONAR(*i*)ES of the same inscription is too badly mutilated to give a certain reading.

² The index of *CIL.* I assigns RETIARII to 1234; but this is a carelessly written inscription, and the stone shows rather RETIARI, a contracted nom., like LANI.

³ Sommer, pp. 377 f.

⁴ Though forms with *El* and *EIS* are much commoner.

15. Of the dat. sing. of *alius*, the older inscriptions display only the contracted form ALEI, *CIL.* I, 206, 1277; the uncontracted (or restored) form appears in Plaut. *Cist.* Arg. 5, *Mil.* 1357.¹

16. In the dat.-abl. pl. of *io-* and *iā-*stems, the same phenomena are found as in the nom. pl. of *M. io-*stems. Forms with IEIS are found in *CIL.* I, as follows:

195 SOCIEIS; 199 CONTROVORSIEIS; 200 AEDIFICIEIS, MOINICIPIEIS *ter*, STIPENDIARIEIS *bis*, VIEIS, V/A-SIEIS; 202 DECVRIEIS, TERTIEIS *bis*; 204 AEDIFICIEIS *quater*, PORTORIEIS *bis*; 205 IVDICIEIS; 206 COMITIEIS, MVNICIPIEIS *ter*, VIEIS *quater*; 542 ALIEIS; 1087 SEPTVMIEIS; 1169 HERENNIEIS; 1199 PA'-PIEIS; 1220 INFERIEIS; 1277 VENERIEIS; 1313 LE-VIEIS; 1480 IVDICIEIS; *CIL.* XI, 3078 A(rg)V'TIEIS.

There are the following contracted forms, with *-īs* written IS or EIS:

199 CONTROVERSIIS,² IANVARIS, VEITVRIS, VETVRIS; 206 COLONEIS *ter*; 1050 OFICEIS.

Both the *-iīs* and the *-īs* forms are abundantly proved by passages in the poets,³ the contracted form occurring of course only after 150 B.C.; INFERIEIS, in the list above, stands in a metrical inscription and has *-iīs*.

Again for dissyllabic *ii* we have IEI, which — though the diphthong is warranted historically⁴ — is only a graphic device to avoid the doubling of I.⁵ Observe that alongside the regular IEIS = *iīs*, we find also PERFVGIS VICANIS 200, QVI IVRATI 577, SENVISANIS SENVISANIS 1199,⁶ showing that I and IS in these forms were familiar to the cutters of the inscriptions.

¹ Either form is permitted in *Mil.* 1076, *Truc.* 744; other occurrences are in lines corrupt or of uncertain metre: *Curc.* 484, *Mil.* 351, *Ps.* 1264.

² The form CONTROVORSIEIS stands in the same inscription, which suggests that CONTROVERSIIS is miswritten, especially as the letters immediately following are legible, but make no sense.

³ Neue-Wagener, 1⁸, 189 ff.

⁴ Sommer, pp. 380 f.

⁵ On INGENVIIS, *CIL.* I, 1492, v. §21.

⁶ Though forms with EIS are much commoner.

It is notable also that on Elogium x, *CIL.* I, p. 279, the forms VENEFICIS VIS occur, with *i longa* apparently to represent *ī*, since the other two forms of the same category, REPETVNDIS STERNVNDIS, have the ordinary *i*; the first named use *i longa* to avoid *ī*. A single *i* for *ī* is proved metrically in INFERIS *CIL.* VI, 12307; there is no other example of *i longa* in this inscription, though DONIS TVIS MERITIS NOBIS occur.

17. A stem in *-eo-* should form its dat.-abl. pl. in dissyllabic EIS, unless contraction had taken place; but EIS was open to misunderstanding as *-īs*, with *Ei* graphic for *ī*. Consequently we find ABIEGNIEIS AESCVLNIEIS¹ *CIL.* I, 577, using *IEI* in the value *ēī*, to avoid *EEl* with repetition of *E*, and *Ei*, which might be read as *ī* merely. These writings are the more noticeable because ABIEGNEA *bis* and ABIEGINEAS (with *i* inserted by error) appear on the same stone, with the phonetically correct *E*.

Certain plural forms of *deus*, *meus*, and *is idem*² have contracted *ī* or re-formed dissyllabic *e-ī*. We find, in *CIL.* I, the following:³

DIS 639, DEIS 1241

MEI 1012, MIEIS 38, MEEIS 1063, MEIS *bis* 1253

Nom. pl. *Ei ter* 200, *quater* 202, 204, *ter* 206

EIS *bis* 197, *quater* 198, 199

EEIS 196; *EEl*, *CIL.* x, 1453

IEI 185,⁴ 202, *quinq̄ies* 204, 205, 206

IEIS 577

EIDEM 197, *quinq̄ies* 202, 566, 567, 1140, 1161, 1162,

1163, 1178, 1189, 1216, 1247; EID. 1227, 1245

EISDEM 198, 1143, 1149, 1187; (*e*)ISDEM 1192

¹ I do not agree with Sturtevant, p. 35, that IEIS in these forms and in certain manuscript readings furnish no presumption of anything more than monosyllabic *ī*.

² The dat. *ei eidem* is discussed separately, §19.

³ I note the following errors in the *Index Verborum* of *CIL.* I:

MEI 1198 should be gen. sing., not nom. pl.

IS 196¹⁷ should be nom. sing., not nom. pl.

EEIS 196⁴ should be nom. pl., not abl. pl. 196⁵.

EIDEM 1140, 1216; (*e*)ISDEM 1192; EID. 1227, 1245; IDEM 1421 should be nom. pl., not nom. sing.

⁴ An uncertain reading; cf. Sturtevant, p. 28.

IDEM 1421, 1(*dem*) 1285IS(*dem*) 1270Dat.-abl. pl. EIS 195, *decies* 198, *bis* 199, *decies* 200, 13*ies* 202, *septies* 203, 15*ies*¹ 206, 603E(*is*) 200, *ter* 203, *bis* 205

IS 198

EEIS *bis* 196IEIS 12*ies* 204, *quater* 205, *novies*¹ 206, 624EIEIS *bis* 201

EISDEM 204, ISDEM 206, IISDEM 206

Sturtevant² has shown that in these forms there are two pronunciations only to deal with: *dī dīs ī īs*, and *de-ī de-īs*, *e-ī e-īs*; similarly, of course, *mī mīs* and *me-ī me-īs*. All the writings listed represent one or the other of these pronunciations; but it is significant that there is no real example of *ī*, since IISDEM 206 is only an error³ for EISDEM, with omission of the cross strokes of E. The same error appears repeatedly on this inscription, in RIM EAI QVIF QVII PROXV-MIIS respectively for REM EAE QVEI QVEI PROXVMEIS. We find *ī* and *Eī* for *ī*, but *Eēī* *Eēī* *Eēī* for *e-ī*. Apparently *Eī* was avoided for *e-ī*, since it was commonly used for the monosyllabic *ē* and *ī*; and *Eēī* was normally replaced dissimilatively by *IEī* and *EIEī*, to avoid the repetition of the letter E.⁴ This same phenomenon has already been seen in ABIEGNIEIS, AESCVLNIEIS.

18. Curiously, as Sturtevant⁵ points out, *IEī* is used for the monosyllabic *ī* at times; the following examples are found:

MIEIS, *CIL.* I, 38, monosyllabic by the meter.LVMPHIEIS, *CIL.* I, 1238MERITIEIS, *CIL.* VI, 19419 } not containing *-īs*, since they areSACRIEIS, *CIL.* X, 5055 } *ā- o*-stems, not *iā- io*-stems.SVIEIS, *CIL.* I, 1042, 1460 }

¹ Cf. Sturtevant, p. 27, footnote 2.

² P. 23, p. 32. His treatment is from the phonetic standpoint, mine from the orthographic. I disagree with him only in a few details.

³ Despite Sturtevant, p. 28.

⁴ The following should in this connection be noted as occurring in *CIL.* I: DIEI 198, *ter* 206; REI, gen. and dat. of *res*, often; REIS *bis* 198, from *reus*; OLEI, gen. of *oleum*, 200, alongside VINEI, gen. of *vinum*.

⁵ P. 8.

To Sturtevant's list may be added MVNICIPIEIS, *CIL.* I, 206 = *municipīs*, acc. pl. of *municeps*. Such writings are the not unnatural result of the confusion in stems having both contracted forms in EI EIS and uncontracted forms in IEI IEIS. IEI in some of the other forms may therefore be graphic for *ī*, though this is not positively demonstrable; but the principle of the avoidance of II is not thereby affected.

19. The dat. sing. *ei* has in Plautus and Terence three metrical values: —; ∪—; ——. ¹ Without going into the vexed question of the origin of the form, it is sufficient for the present purpose to say that the normal phonetic development gave a monosyllabic *ei* by the time of Plautus; that “*ēī*” is in reality *ejī*, re-formed after the analogy of *ejus*; that *ēī* is a re-formation after the analogy of *eum eam eō* etc. In the authors the normal orthography for all of these was *ei*—though *i* might have been written for the monosyllable.²

In the older inscriptions we find the following:

EI, = *ī*, and possibly *e-ī* and *ejī*: often in *CIL.* I, 197, 198, 200, 202, 205, 206, 209, 571, 1409, 1418.

EIEI, = *ejī*, *septies* *CIL.* I, 198 (dated 123/2 B.C.), alongside numerous instances of EI in the same inscription.

IEI, = *ē-ī*, *bis* *CIL.* I, 205, with graphic dissimilation from EEI to avoid EE; the same stone shows EI several times.

EEI, = *ē-ī*, *CIL.* x, 1453 (apparently of early imperial date).³

Similarly, the datives *huic* and *cui* have triple values; but a discussion of them would be aside from the purpose of this paper.

20. The last class of words containing dissyllabic *ii* is formed by the perfects like *ii abii petii munii*, in the perfect indicative active (except the third person plural), in the perfect infinitive, and in the pluperfect subjunctive. In republican times we find the doubled I avoided in various ways (citations from *CIL.* I):

¹ Citations in Neue-Wagener, II³, 378 f.

² After 150 B.C. But the spelling *ei* would be much more easily recognizable as going with *ejus*, *eum*, etc.

³ As gen. sing., it has both MVNICIPI and MVNICIPII.

By the use of parallel forms with IVI: AVDIVIT 201; CONQUAESIVEI 551; MVNIVIT 618; (*po*)LIVIT 1258; POSEIVEI 551; SCIVIT 200, 204, 571; SIVIT 1019.

By the use of IEI = *i-i* or *i-ï*: PETIEI 38; INTERIEISTI¹ 1202; OBIEIT, p. 210 *init.*; REDIEIT 541; VENIEIT *sexies* 200.

By the use of contracted forms, with I or EI = *i*: ABIT 1450; OBEIT 1411; OBIT 1539 *b*; PERISTI 685; PEREIT 1254; PERISTIS 646, 647; POSEIT 1281, 1283; POSIT 1282, 1298, 1436; POSE(*it*) 1378.

By graphic dissimilation of the second I to E: ADIESE ADIESET ADIESENT 196.²

Thus, to avoid II, we find alternative forms in IVI, or contracted forms, or forms with dissimilative writings, having EI or E for I after I. No instance of II occurs. It is notable that *CIL.* I, 38, contains, besides PETIEI, the forms ACCVMVLAVI GENVI OPTENVI; the final *i* is represented by I except in the one form where it is preceded by I, and then EI is written. Also, in *CIL.* I, 196, alongside ADIESE ADIESET ADIESENT for *adi-iss-*, we find all other similar forms to have -IS-, as follows:

ARFVISE, CONPROMESISE, COMVOVISE, CONSPONDISE,
DEDISE, FECISE *quater*, FECISENT, HABVISE *bis*,
IOVSISET *bis*.

21. In republican times, therefore, II was avoided for dissyllabic *ii*: is II found at all in republican inscriptions?

¹ LEGEISTI, *Eph. Ep.* VII, p. 161, stands on an archaizing inscription containing various inaccuracies in spelling, and is merely a false writing for LEGISTEI.

I do not agree with Sommer, p. 628, that INTERIEISTI and ADIESE etc. prove a form *iïsti*, whence *iït iïsse* etc., and *petiit petiïsse* etc. Length is attested only in the third singular perfect indicative (citations, Neue-Wagener, III³, 426 f.); here there were two forms in primitive Italic, an active in -*e* and a middle in -*ai*, to both of which the Italic added a -*t*; *tutudit* and *tutudît* have respectively -*et* and -*ait*, corresponding to Sanskrit active *tutôda* and middle *tutudê*.

² On the other hand, verbs of this type show IE and IVE indiscriminately, in case the I or IV is followed not by I, but by E: *CIL.* I, 197 INIERIT; 198 ABIERIT *quinquies*, PETIVERIT, AVDIERIT, QUAESIERIT, CONQUAESIVERIT; 199 COMPOSEIVERVNT; 200 ADIERIT, ADIERINT, VENIERIT *quater*; 201 AVDIVERAMVS; 205 PETIERIT; 206 ADIERINT, INIERINT *bis*; 207 PETIVERIT; 1009 DEPOSIERVNT; 1284 POSIERVNT.

Outside of INGENVIIS, *CIL.* I, 1492, = *ingenuis*,¹ we find II only in inscriptions using II as a representation of E; but in such inscriptions we find III and even IIII and IIIII in various values, as follows (citations from *CIL.* I):

ATILIIIS 42, = dat. pl. *Atilies*.

A(t)IIIDIVS 182, = *Atiedius*.

IIRINIII 182, = dat. sing. *Erinie*.

SIBIIIIIT 1180, = *sibei et*.

PATOLIIIA 1501, = *Patoleja*.

PONTIIIS *bis*, p. 555 ad n. 194, = *Ponties*.

QVIII 818, = *quei*; QVI also occurs on the same inscription.

SIIC *bis* 818, = *seic*.

TIBIII 818, = *tibe*.

IIIDVS 866, 930, 976, 983, 1539 *d*; IIIDV. 867; IIID. 905, 935, 957; III. 846, 902, = *Eidus* and its abbreviations.

A. DIIIDVS 822, = *a. di. Eidus* for *ante diem Eidus*.²

DIII 947, = *die(m)*.

Other writings of II are errors: PIILOMVSVS 1352 is for PHILO-; IISDEM DIIBVS, QVII, PROXVIIIS, all in 206 (lines 5, 40, 41), are errors for EISDEM DIEBVS, QVEI, PROXVMEIS, all of which occur repeatedly on the same inscription,³ which moreover is of notoriously careless writing.⁴

Thus, in republican times, if II = *e* were used, there was no objection to III, in any value, nor to IIII, nor even to IIIII; but when II = *e* was not used, the doubling of I was avoided.

22. The avoidance of VV died out at about the end of the republic. If we take the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, *CIL.* III, pp. 769 ff., as typical of carefully written early imperial inscriptions, we find (a)NNVVM, I, 35; IVV(*enes*), II, 46; IVVI, III, 34; IVVENTATIS, IV, 8; RIVVM, IV, 12; VIVVS, IV, 16; but also IVENTVTIS, III, 5. Other official inscriptions of the time show a similar state of affairs.

¹ Cf. §13 for gen. STATII and CAESII, *CIL.* I, 757 and 758.

² So the *CIL.*; but this idiom is peculiar, and *a. d. III Id.* may be suggested as an alternative.

³ EISDEM does not indeed occur; but EIS is found many times, and ISDEM once.

⁴ Cf. §17.

Likewise, *II* is no longer avoided in the *Mon. Anc.*, though the single *I* is still written in about half the instances :

With *II* : *CONSILIIS*, III, 3 ; *IVDICIIS*, I, 10 ; *MANIBIIS*, III, 8, III, 17, (*mani*)*BIIS*, IV, 21-22, *MANIBIIS*, IV, 24 ; *MVNICIPIIS*, IV, 27, *MVNICIPII(s)*, IV, 29 ; *IIS*, I, 18.

With one *I* : *AVSPICIS*, I, 25 ; *COLON(i)S*, III, 17, *COLO(n)IS*, III, 19, *COLONIS*, IV, 27 ; *MVNICIPIIS*, III, 23 ; (*pr*)*OVINCIS*, II, 37 ; *STIPENDIS*, III, 31 ; *DIS*, I, 26.

Again, the evidence of other official inscriptions is similar.

Thus, though many contracted forms still occur, writings with *II* and *II* (whatever pronunciation they represent) form a goodly percentage of the occurrences in early imperial inscriptions. Sturtevant's statistics¹ show this lack of prejudice against *II* in later times, and also the use of *II* for *i* where a dissyllabic value is out of the question ; to his list may be added *GERMANICII*, Henzen, *Acta Frat. Arv.*, p. LXXIV.

23. Why now did Accius recommend *EI* for *i* rather than *II*, though he prescribed *AA EE OO VV* for the other long vowels ? The ordinary view that it was to avoid confusion with *II* = *e* will hardly stand, since it appears that in inscriptions with *II* = *e* no objection was felt to the decidedly ambiguous writing *III*. Of course Accius found *EI* in use for the sound *i*, which gave him a starting point ; but the reason for his avoidance of *II* must have been a fear that it would have been mistaken for dissyllabic *i-i*, which, as we have seen, was a common form in the paradigms at the time of the rules of Accius (somewhat after 150 B.C.). On the other hand, dissyllabic *a-a e-e o-o u-u* hardly occur, and hence this obstacle would not stand in the way of doubling those letters to represent the simple long sound.

A-a appears only in an occasional foreign name, like *Phraates* ; *e-e* is found in the present subjunctive of *meo beo*, and in certain forms of *deesse deerrare praeesse praeo* ; *o-o* occurs in a few compounds of *co-*, as *coopto cooperio cooperor coorior* ; *u-u* is found only in a few forms of adjectives like

¹ Pp. 10-14, 22 f., 30-32.

perspicuus assiduus, and in the gen. pl. of the fourth declension.¹ Even in these the repetition of the letter is largely avoided by the use of contracted forms.² The Roman poets furnish the following contractions of *ee* and *oo* :

dest, Verg. *Aen.* x, 378, Hor. *Epist.* i, 12, 24, *CIL.* xi, 627 (written DEEST); *derat*, Verg. *Mor.* 64,³ Ovid *Met.* x, 88;³ DERANT, *CIL.* vi, 1754; *dero*, Hor. *Sat.* i, 9, 56 and ii, 1, 17; *derit*, Verg. *Georg.* ii, 233,³ *Aen.* vii, 262, Hor. *Sat.* ii, 2, 98, Ovid *Met.* xv, 354; *derunt*, Ovid *Met.* xiii, 819; *dessem*, Catull. 64, 151; *desse*,⁴ Lucr. i, 43, Ovid *Epist.* xvii, 136.
derrare, Plaut. *Men.* 1113;⁵ *derrarunt*, Lucr. iii, 860; *derraverat*, Verg. *Ecl.* vii, 7; *derrasse*, Lucr. i, 711; *derrantes*, Sen. *Phaed.* 1069.
coperiunt, Lucr. vi, 491; *coperuisse*, Lucr. v, 342; COPERTAE, *CIL.* viii, 20277.⁶
coritur, Aetna 408.

On the other hand, we find certain examples of failure to contract :

dēest: Stat. *Theb.* viii, 236, x, 236, xi, 276.⁷
coortus and its forms: Lucr. often (32 times); Verg. *Georg.* iii, 478, *Aen.* i, 148, x, 405; Ovid *Met.* xi, 512, *Tr.* v, 5, 29; Sil. Ital. vi, 415, vii, 547, x, 185; Sen. *Phaed.* 887.
coortu: Lucr. vi, 671.

¹ Any omissions are inadvertent, and would not materially increase the number of dissyllabic *aa*'s, etc.

² It is not here a question of words in which like vowels were originally separated by a consonant, as in *cohors cōrs*, *vehemēns vēmēns*; nor of those with contraction of unlike vowels, as in *cōgō cōlēscō*.

³ *dē-ē-* possible, but not likely. On this contraction of *de-e-*, cf. Vel. Long. vii, 65 K.

⁴ *deesse*, Plaut. *Rud.* 636 (cf. Lodge, *Lexicon Plautinum* s.v.) is a conjecture which cannot be used as evidence either way.

⁵ Probably so to be read, with hiatus following.

⁶ For *cō-* here and in the *Carm. adv. Marc.*, v. *Thes. L. L.* s.v. *coopero*; it is this form with *ō* which has given rise to the Romance words; cf. Körting, *Lat.-rom. Wtb.* s.v. *coopero*.

The following may or may not be contracted: *coperta*, Turp. *Com.* 23 Ribbeck³; *cooperta*, Lucr. vi, 1269; *cooperto*, Hor. *Sat.* ii, 1, 68; *cooriuntur*, Plaut. *Persa*, 313.

⁷ Cf. Klotz, *Arch. Lat. Lex.* xv, 406.

These examples are all from *coortus* -a -um, and *coortus* -ūs, except some late ones of *deest*; and with the exception of the example in Seneca, those of *coortus* all appear at the end of dactylic hexameter verses: it is clear that a word of the value $\cup - \cup$ is a convenient tag in this meter, which accounts for the failure to contract.¹

The combination *u-u* is avoided by writing VO, or by the use of the alternative gen. pl. of the fourth declension in VM: *passum*: Plaut. *Men.* 177, *Truc.* 334; Lucil. 114, 506 Marx; Mart. 11, 5, 3. *currum*: Verg. *Aen.* vi, 653.

Similar writings occur on inscriptions, as follows (examples from *CIL.* unless otherwise noted):

PHRATI, *Mon. Anc.* vi, 1; PHRATES, *ib.* vi, 4.

DERANT, vi, 1754, xi, 6959;² DERVNT, 11, 1964; DE'RVNT, vi, 1527.

PRAEVNTE, Henzen, *Acta Frat. Arv.*, pp. LXXVII, ci bis.

PRAERAT, xi, 1421; PRAERANT, *Mon. Anc.* 111, 35; PRAERIT, *quater* 1, 206; PRAERVNT, 1, 206, xi, 1421; PRAESSE, 1, 198; (*p*)RAESSE(*t*), 1, 205.

COPTATO, 1, 206 (also COAPTATO, *ib.*, by error); COPTAVE-RVNT, v, 4921, viii, 68; COP., x, 5914 (= *coptatus*), x, 5916 (= *coptati*); cf. *coptari*, Cic. *Fam.* 111, 10, 9 in Cod. Med.

COPERTAE, viii, 20277.

Gen. pl. EXERCITVM, vi, 414, *Mon. Anc.* v, 40; DOMVM, x, 1401.

A few examples of the doubling of the letter in these words have come to my notice in the inscriptions:

DEEST, xi, 627 (here metrically *dest*), *Röm. Quartalschr.* xxii, 88; DEESSE, *CIL.* vi, 1711, and De Rossi, *Insc. Chr.* 1, p. 1077 (A.D. 495 or 514).

PRAEEVNTE, Henzen, *op. cit.*, pp. LXXI bis, cvii, cxiv; (*p*)RAEE-VNTE, *ib.*, p. xci.

COOPTO and its forms, Henzen, *op. cit.*, pp. xxx ter, xcii, cii bis, cxv, cxxxi, cliv, clix bis.

But in the numbered inscriptions of *CIL.* 1, the only examples of dissyllabic EE etc., which I can find, are MEEIS 1063,

¹ Cf. *cohorta*, with *h* to show hiatus, *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* 11, 103, 4, v, 278, 63; also Varro, *LL.* v, 88, Gell. 11, 17, 6 f.

² Not accessible to me; I take the reference from the *Thes. Ling. Lat.* s.v.

EEIS *ter* 196, SVVM 206, DVVMVIRVM 577, DVVM VIR 1235, and the doubtful STATII 757, CAESII 758; other examples of doubling of the vowels indicate length or combinations like *vu* or *uv* — not *u-u* and the like. Thus AA EE OO VV for *ā ē ō ū* were practically not ambiguous; but II might have been mistaken for *i-ĭ*, a common combination of sounds. This was Accius' reason for prescribing EI, and not II, to represent *ī*.

24. The prevalence of *-iei* and *-ieis* in plural endings of *io*-stems may have contributed to perpetuate *ei* in these endings after other sounds also. Historically, we should have the diphthong in the plural endings of the second declension, but *-i* in the genitive singular. As a matter of fact, in pure *o*-stems (not *io*-stems) *CIL.* I shows EI in over 80 per cent of plural forms and in about 40 per cent of the genitives singular. This condition in the singular accords neither with what is historically correct, nor with the rule of Lucilius (requiring *i*), nor with the rule of Accius (requiring *ei*). In the plural, all three — history, Lucilius, Accius — unite upon *ei*; yet only 80 per cent of pure *o*-stems have the diphthong. It seems to me likely, therefore, that the regularity of *-iei* and *-ieis* in the plural endings of *io*-stems, through the principle of the avoidance of II, was the main factor in perpetuating *ei* in plural endings of pure *o*-stems.

25. RESULTS:

(1) At all periods a single I is written after vowels in the value of *i-ĭ* in such words as *Pompei reicio*, and after consonants with the value *ji* in such words as *abicio*, as well as in the value *i-j* intervocalic as in *ajo*: this is a dissimilative loss in writing, of one I in II, and of two I's in III.

NOTE. Rarely, *ji* and *i-ĭ* appear as IE, by dissimilative change.

(2) In republican times, the use of II to denote dissyllabic *i-ī* was avoided on inscriptions by using IEI or IE: a dissimilative change of the second I to EI or to E.

NOTE 1. This avoidance did not last beyond the republican period.

NOTE 2. But where II = *e* was used, there was no avoidance of III in various values.

(3) In republican times, and to some extent even later, doubled AA EE OO VV were avoided for dissyllabic *a-a e-e o-o u-u*, by writing normally a single A E O V, which indicates either phonetic contraction, or a graphic dissimilative loss; while EEI was normally written IEI, a dissimilative change.

(4) OV and V were used to represent *uv*, and V was used for *vu*, as well as VO for *vu* and *u-u*: instances of dissimilative change and loss.

(5) The avoidance of II and VV was not to avoid ambiguous writings, but was part and parcel of the dislike for repeating any written character.

(6) The avoidance of II for *ī* in the rules of Accius was not due to a desire to avoid confusion with II = *e*, but was to avoid confusion with dissyllabic *i-ī*, which at that time was a very common combination of sounds.

(7) The use of *ei* after *i* in plural endings of *io*-stems was the cause of the prevalence of *ei* in these endings of pure *o*-stems.

(8) On *aine*, §4; on dat. *ei huic quoi*, §19; on *-īt* in the perfect, cf. §20 footnote.